



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/848,515	05/03/2001	Matti Kantola	617-010289-US(PAR)	7554	
2512 7590	03/12/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
PERMAN & GREEN			DAO, M	DAO, MINH D	
425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2682 DATE MAILED: 03/12/2004	a	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
\$. ••	Office Action Summan	09/848,515	KANTOLA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit			
		MINH D DAO	2682			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>_</u> .				
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	s action is non-final.				
3)[☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under t	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureasee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application in the second	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen	t (s)					
1) Notic 2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Page 1				

Art Unit: 2682

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "the," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/848,515 Page 3

Art Unit: 2682

4. Regarding claim 10, the claim, as amended, recites the limitation "said link" and "said third party" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 11-14 are dependent claims of claim 10 therefore are rejected for the

same reason set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1,6,7,8,9,15,16,17,18,19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Altschul et al. (US 6,144,847).

Regarding claim 1, Altschul teaches a portable communications device comprising communication means for communicating with a another party (See fig. 1; col.3, lines 24-45), and identification means for separately providing information on the device (figs. 1 and 2, item 48, Magnetic Strip), the another party (figs 2 and 3, item 100, Reader Terminal) being arranged to obtain the information from the identification means and to

Art Unit: 2682

use the information to establish communication with the communication means (col. 4,

lines 47-61; Also see figs. 3 and 4).

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Altschul teaches a portable communications device as

claimed in claims 1 and 6 respectively, wherein the magnetic data carrying arrangement

comprises a magnetic strip (See figs. 2 and 3, item 48, Magnetic Strip).

Regarding claim 8, Altschul teaches a portable communications device as claimed in

claim 1, wherein the information provided by the identification means comprises one or

more of the following: Identity of the device; address of the device when the

communication means are used; and identity of the user (col. 4, lines 47-51).

Regarding claim 9, Altschul teaches a portable communications device as claimed in

claim 1, wherein the another party is one of the following devices: point of sale device;

ticket gate device; and information kiosk (col. 4, lines 40-47).

Regarding claim 15, Altschul teaches a portable communications device as claimed in

claim 1, wherein the communications device is a mobile telephone (See fig. 1, col. 3,

lines 24-45).

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/848,515 Page 5

Art Unit: 2682

Regarding claim 16, the claim has all limitations of claim 1 and an additional limitation

that the communication means for communicating with a portable party. It is well known

in the art that a conventional credit card reader, as indicated in reference Altschul (col.

4, lines 52-59) should be a portable device. Therefore, claim 16 is rejected for the same

reasons set forth above and in claim 1.

Regarding claim 17, the claim has the same limitations of claim 1, therefore is rejected

for the same reason set forth in claim 1.

Regarding claim 18, the claim has the same limitations of claim 16, therefore is rejected

for the same reason set forth in claim 16.

Regarding claim 19, the claim has the same limitations of claim 15, therefore is rejected

for the same reason set forth in claim 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2682

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altschul (US Patent 6,144,847) in view of McGregor (US Patent 5,625,669).

Regarding claims 2-4, Altschul teaches all limitations of claim 1. However, Altschul fails to teach that the bar code is arranged on the exterior of the communications device (including on the display of the device). McGregor, in an analogous art, teaches a bar code that is arranged on the exterior of a communications device (col. 20, lines 19-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Page 6

Art Unit: 2682

invention was made to provide the teaching McGregor to Altschul in order to have various ways of providing identification information.

Page 7

10. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altschul (US Patent 6,144,847) in view of Gaucher (US Patent 6,175,860).

Regarding claim 5, Altschul teaches all limitations of claim 1. However, Altschul fails to teach that the identification means comprises a radio frequency tag. Gaucher, in an analogous art, teaches an identification means comprising a radio frequency tag (col. 3, lines 43-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Gaucher to Altschul in order to have various ways of providing identification information.

Conclusion

- 11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - a. Theimer et al. (US 5,627,517) discloses Decentralized Tracking And Routing System Wherein Packages Are Associated With Active Tags.

Art Unit: 2682

b. Grabau (US 6,634,560) discloses Radio Frequency Identification Tagging,

Page 8

Encoding/Reading Through A Digitizer Tablet.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to MINH D DAO whose telephone number is 703-305-

5589. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, VIVIAN C CHIN can be reached on 703-308-6739. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Minh Dao Examiner Art Unit 2682

February 25, 2004 / 2004

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

318/0x